

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed on August 17, 2009. Claims 1-25 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-25 have been rejected. Claims 1, 10, 15, and 17 have been amended to further define the scope and novelty of the present invention, and to address claim objections and §101 rejections, in order to place the claims in condition for allowance. Support for the amendments to the claims is found in Figures 2A-2D and 2F, and on pages 5- 9 of the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been presented. Claims 23-25 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-22 remain pending. For the reasons set forth more fully below, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are allowable. Consequently, reconsideration, allowance, and passage to issue are respectfully requested.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for phone interview of November 12, 2009. The objections, the 35 U.S.C. §101 and §103 rejections, and possible amendments for overcoming the objections and rejections were discussed. We appreciate the courtesy and helpfulness of the Examiner in the interview. The claims have been amended in light of the points made by the Examiner in the interview.

Double Patenting/Terminal Disclaimer

Examiner Stated:

Claims 1, 10, 15 and 17 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 7 and 10 of U.S. Patent No. 7,174,508.

...

In response, Applicants will file a terminal disclaimer upon determinability of allowance of the claims in view of the prior art.

Specification

Examiner Stated:

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o), Correction of the following is required:

The instant specification failed to clearly define the claimed subject matter “computer-readable storage medium”, as such, the claimed subject matter is lacking of antecedent basis.

In response, Applicants amended the paragraph beginning on page 2, line 17, of the specification to clarify that the invention can be “implemented in a computer program which can be stored in a recordable data storage medium for use in a computer system. This language now supports the claimed subject matter “computer-readable storage medium.” Support for the recordable data storage medium is found in original claim 22, which recites a medium that is a “recordable data storage medium.” Furthermore, Applicants amended the paragraph beginning on page 2, line 17, of the specification to delete the phrase, “signal, such as on a modulated carrier signal.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the amended specification is proper.

Claim Objections

Examiner Stated:

Claims 18-25, are objected to because of the following informalities:

As to claims 18-25, these dependent claims have a leftover typing error (i.e., the claimed “signal-baring medium” should be changed to “computer-readable storage medium”, because the independent claim for these claims recites a “computer-readable storage medium”.) ...

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the paragraph beginning on page 2, line 17, of the specification address the claim objections. Furthermore, in a previous Amendment, claims 18-25 have been amended to remove all references to a “signal-baring medium.” Furthermore, claims 23-25 have been cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 18-22 are proper.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Examiner Stated:

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. ...

In response, claims 1, 10, 15, and 17 have been amended to clarify that their respective elements/steps are implemented by a computer, which is statutory subject matter. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the paragraph beginning on page 2, line 17, of the specification also address the §101 rejections. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-25 comply with 35 U.S.C. §101.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Examiner Stated:

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mikurak (U.S. Patent No. 6,606,744) in view of Wyatt (U.S. Patent No. 6,041,411).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s rejections. The present invention provides a system for enabling the purchase of a package. In accordance with one embodiment the present invention, the system includes a catalog database that includes a catalog entry table that includes package data correlated to at least one unresolved

package, wherein a package is a group of pieces of merchandise to be sold together, wherein an unresolved package is a package having one or more products with at least one unresolved attribute, wherein a product is a piece of merchandise that has at least one unresolved attribute, and wherein an unresolved attribute is an attribute value that has not been specified by a customer, wherein the catalog entry table stores a catalog entry identifier (ID) for each product. The catalog database further includes a product attribute table that stores attribute, wherein each attribute is associated with a catalog entry ID in the catalog entry table. The catalog database further includes a product attribute value table that stores attribute values, wherein each attribute value is associated with an attribute in the product attribute table. The catalog database further includes a package attribute table that stores attribute IDs, wherein each attribute ID is associated with an attribute value in the product attribute value table. The catalog database further includes a package relationship table that stores package IDs, wherein each package ID corresponds to an attribute value in the in the package attribute table. The system further includes a selection module coupled to the catalog database for allowing the customer to select at least one unresolved package for purchase. The system further includes a resolution module coupled to the catalog database for resolving the at least one unresolved attribute of the one or more products in the selected unresolved package by matching a selected catalog entry ID from the catalog entry table with a corresponding package ID in the package relationship table, wherein the corresponding package ID indicates a resolved package, and wherein the selected catalog entry ID matches the package ID after the customer has selected an attribute value for the at least one unresolved attribute, wherein the selected attribute value corresponds to an attribute value in the product attribute value

table, and wherein the elements above are implemented by a computer. Mikurak in view of Wyatt does not teach or suggest these features, as discussed below.

Mikurak discloses a system, a method, and an article of manufacture for collaborative installation management in a network-based supply chain environment. Telephone calls, data and other multimedia information are routed through a network system which includes transfer of information across the internet utilizing telephony routing information and internet protocol address information. The system includes integrated Internet Protocol (IP) telephony services allowing a user of a web application to communicate in an audio fashion in-band without having to pick up another telephone. Users can click a button and go to a call center through the network using IP telephony. The system invokes an IP telephony session simultaneously with the data session, and uses an active directory lookup whenever a user uses the system. Users include service providers and manufacturers utilizing the network-based supply chain environment. (Abstract.)

Wyatt discloses a method for defining and verifying user access rights to computer information. The method verifies user access rights to electronically transmitted digital information. A second computer system transmits requested digital information to a requesting first computing system in wrapped form, which includes digital instructions that must be successfully executed, or unwrapped, before access to the digital information is allowed. Successful unwrapping requires that certain conditions must be verified in accordance with the digital instructions, thereby allowing access to the digital information. (Abstract.)

Applicants agree with the Examiner that Mikurak does not disclose resolving the unresolved attribute products in a package by matching a selected catalog entry identifier with a package identifier. Applicants respectfully submit that Mikurak also does not teach or suggest the combination of, “a product attribute table that stores attributes, wherein each attribute is associated with a catalog entry ID in the catalog entry table; a product attribute value table that stores attribute values, wherein each attribute value is associated with an attribute in the product attribute table; a package attribute table that stores attribute IDs, wherein each attribute ID is associated with an attribute value in the product attribute value table; and a package relationship table that stores package IDs, wherein each package ID corresponds to an attribute value in the in the package attribute table,” as recited in amended independent claim 1.

The Examiner referred to a database in Mikurak, referring specifically to modules 5300 and 5324 of Figure 53, Figure 80, and Figure 121. However, modules 5300 and 5324 of Figure 53 merely show a “commerce” block and a “common web services” block, respectively. Figure 80 of Mikurak only generally describes “providing data access from multiple simultaneous data sources over a network framework,” and “storing application data over the network framework.” Figure 121 of Mikurak merely shows a block diagram of a network. None of these figures of Mikurak teach or suggest the combination of tables and their respective relationships as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Amended independent claim 1 also recites, “a resolution module coupled to the catalog database for resolving the at least one unresolved attribute of the one or more products in the selected unresolved package by matching a selected catalog entry ID from the catalog entry table with a corresponding package ID in the package relationship table,

wherein the corresponding package ID indicates a resolved package, and wherein the selected catalog entry ID matches the package ID after the customer has selected an attribute value for the at least one unresolved attribute, wherein the selected attribute value corresponds to an attribute value in the product attribute value table, and wherein the elements above are implemented by a computer.” The Examiner referred to a problem handling process 1502 in Figure 21 and to column 46, line 54, to column 48, line 41 of Mikurak. However, these sections of Mikurak merely describe the resolution of trouble notifications, which is not the same as resolving unresolved packages, as in the present invention. Furthermore, these sections of Mikurak fail to teach or suggest the combination of tables and their respective relationships as recited in amended independent claim 1.

The Examiner relied on Wyatt to cure the defects of Mikurak. Applicants respectfully submit that Wyatt also fails to teach or suggest the combination of tables and their respective relationships as recited in amended independent claim 1. Wyatt merely describes verification of user access rights to computer information. Figure 7 of Wyatt shows a single catalog file, which is different from the combination of tables, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Therefore, Mikurak in view of Wyatt does not teach or suggest the cooperation of elements as recited in amended independent claim 1, and this claim is thus allowable over Mikurak in view of Wyatt .

Independent claims 10, 15, and 17

Independent claims 10, 15, and 17 are method, program product, and computer-readable storage medium claims, respectively, similar in scope to amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, the above-articulated arguments related to amended independent

claim 1 apply with equal force to claims 10, 15, and 17. Therefore, claims 10, 15, and 17 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Dependent claims

Dependent claims 2-9, 11-14, 16, and 18-22 depend from amended independent claims 1, 10, 15, and 17, respectively. Accordingly, the above-articulated arguments related to amended independent claims 1, 10, 15, and 17 apply with equal force to claims 2-9, 11-14, 16, and 18-22, which are thus allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 10, 15, and 17.

Furthermore, amended dependent claim 5 recites, “wherein the product attribute table stores product ID and attribute ID tuples, wherein each product ID and attribute ID tuple corresponds to an attribute, wherein at least one product ID is associated with a catalog ID in the catalog entry table; wherein the product attribute value table that stores attribute ID and attribute value ID tuples, wherein each attribute ID and attribute value ID tuple corresponds to an attribute value, wherein at least one attribute ID in the product attribute value table is associated with a one attribute ID in the product attribute table; wherein the package attribute table that stores attribute ID and package attribute ID tuples, wherein each attribute ID and package attribute ID tuple corresponds to a package ID, wherein at least one attribute ID is associated with an attribute ID in the product attribute table; wherein the package relationship table that stores package ID and component ID tuples, wherein each package ID and component ID tuple corresponds to a package type, wherein at least one package ID is associated with a package ID in the product attribute table; wherein the selected attribute value corresponds to an attribute value corresponding to an attribute ID and attribute value ID tuple in the product attribute value table.”

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to teach or suggest these limitations.

CONCLUSION

Applicants' attorney believes this application is in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP PC

November 17, 2009

Date

/Joseph A Sawyer, Jr./
Joseph A Sawyer, Jr.
Attorney for the Applicants
Reg. No. 30,801

Customer Number 45728

(650) 493-4540

(650) 493-4549